arXiv:1604.05589v1 [stat.ME] 19 Apr 2016

Coupling couples with copulas: analysis of assortative mating

Aristidis K. Nikoloulopoulos* Peter G. Moffatt†

Abstract

A novel copula-based bivariate panel ordinal model is applied to self-reported (ordinal) data on risk attitudes for males and females within married couples, from the German Socio-Economic Panel over the period 2004-2012. In the first step, a copula-based Markov model is used to relate the marginal distribution of the response in different time periods, separately for males and females. In the second step, another copula is used to couple the males' and females' conditional (on the past) distributions. This coupling copula accounts for the dependence between males and females, and is therefore the focal point of the paper. We find positive dependence, both in the middle of the distribution, and in the joint tails, and we interpret this as positive assortative mating on risk attitude. By estimating the model separately for different time ranges, we then find evidence that middle- and tail-dependence both increase with years of marriage, and this is interpreted as evidence of "socialization".

Keywords: Copula models; Joint tail probabilities; Markov models; Panel ordinal data; Risk-lovers/avoiders.

1 Introduction

Ever since Becker's (1974) theory of marriage, economists have been interested in the factors that lead to a stable marriage. It was Becker who introduced the term "assortative mating", which relates to the factors each party seeks in the other: "men differing in physical capital, education or intelligence (aside from their effects on wage rates), height, race, or many other traits will tend to marry women with like values of these traits" (Becker, 1974, page 326). The study of assortative mating is crucial to understand the formation of households, which is essential for the development of child human capital – the basis for economic and social progress.

There is a good deal of empirical evidence relating to Becker's assortative mating hypothesis. Positive spousal correlations have been found: (a) in anthropometric features (Belot and Fidrmuc, 2010; Oreffice and Quintana-Domeque, 2010; Chiappori et al., 2012; Hitsch et al., 2010; Kooreman, 1994; McPherson et al., 2001), (b) in health an well-being (Powdthavee, 2009; Wilson, 2002), and (c) in smoking behaviour, see e.g., Clark and Etilé (2006); Chiappori et al. (2015). In this paper, we focus on a trait that is of particular interest to economists: risk attitude. Bacon et al. (2014) also used the repeated data on married couples within the German Socio-Economic Panel to investigate spousal correlation in risk attitude. They applied the bivariate panel ordered probit model to the self-reported risk attitude data from this source, and they found that the individual-specific effects (in the

*A.Nikoloulopoulos@uea.ac.uk, School of Computing Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK

†P.Moffatt@uea.ac.uk, School of Economics, University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK

risk attitude equation) for the two members of a married couple, are positively correlated. This was interpreted in terms of positive assortative mating on risk attitude: individuals seek partners with similar risk attitude. As stressed by Bacon et al. (2014), it is not obvious that spousal correlation in risk attitude will be positive. Risk-sharing arguments would lead to the hypothesis of negative correlation, or "disassortative mating" (Chiappori and Reny, 2006). And, after all, according to a very well-known maxim, "opposites attract".

In this paper we delve deeper into the investigation of assortative mating on risk attitude, by applying the copula approach. The main advantage of the copula approach is that it can allow a wide range of flexible tail dependence and asymmetry between the two variables (here male's and female's risk attitude) under investigation. The normality assumption used by Bacon et al. (2014) is mathematically convenient, but one of our points is that this assumption is not reasonable if there is some skewness in the joint tails.

For example, could it be that risk-lovers are particularly keen to match with other risk-lovers (positive tail dependence)? Could it be that risk-avoiders are particularly keen to match with risk-lovers (negative tail dependence)? Such features of the dependence structure may be captured when the copula approach is used. We are particularly interested in whether and how this dependence structure changes with years of marriage. A very interesting hypothesis is that of socialization (Arnett, 1995): a process by which attitudes become more similar with time. This hypothesis can be investigated by estimating the copula model separately for different stages of marriage.

We will use a general copula construction, based on a set of bivariate copulas to jointly model bivariate ordinal time-series responses with covariates. We call this the "joint copula-based Markov model". For the proposed model, we construct the joint distribution in terms of three bivariate copulas. For each ordinal time series we consider a copula-based Markov model, where a parametric copula family is used for the joint distribution of subsequent observations and then we relate these ordinal time-series responses using another copula to couple their conditional (on the past) distributions at each time point.

Much is known about properties of parametric bivariate copula families in terms of dependence and tail behavior. In this paper we draw on this wealth of knowledge. The discretized bivariate normal (BVN) model is a special case of our general construction when all the bivariate linking copulas are BVN. Other choices of copulas are better if (a) Y_j's have more probability in joint upper or lower tail than would be expected with a discretized BVN, or (b) Y_j's can be considered as discretized maxima/minima or mixtures of discretized means rather than discretized means (Nikoloulopoulos and Joe, 2015). Copulas that arise from extreme value theory have more probability in one joint tail (upper or lower) than expected with a discretized MVN distribution or an MVN copula with discrete margins. It is also possible that there can be more probability in both the joint upper and joint lower tail, compared with discretized MVN models. This happens if the respondents consist of a "mixture" population (e.g., different genders). From the theory of elliptical distributions and copulas, it is known that some scale mixtures of MVN have more dependence in the tails.

The theory and application of copulas have become important in finance, insurance and other areas, in order to deal with dependence in the joint tails (Joe et al., 2010). Here, we indicate that this can also be important into the concept of assortative mating. The remainder of the paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 has a brief overview of relevant copula theory. Section 3 introduces the joint copula-based Markov model for discrete ordinal responses with covariates and discusses its relationship with existing models. Section 4 discusses suitable parametric families of copulas for the joint copula-based

Markov model for discrete ordinal responses with covariates. Estimation techniques and computational details are provided in Section 5. Section 6 presents the applications of our methodology to assortative mating using data from the German Socio-Economic Panel over the period 2004–2012. It turns out that our model, with linking copulas selected according to the ordinal responses being plausibly based on mixtures of means, provides better fit than the discretized MVN model. We conclude with some discussion in Section 7.

2 Overview and relevant background for copulas

A copula is a multivariate cumulative distribution function (cdf) with uniform $U(0,1)$ margins (Joe, 1997; Nelsen, 2006; Joe, 2014). If F is a bivariate cdf with univariate margins F_1, F_2, then Sklar's (1959) theorem implies that there is a copula C such that

$$F(y_1, y_2) = C\Big(F_1(y_1), F_2(y_2)\Big). \tag{1}$$

The copula is unique if F_1, F_2 are continuous, but not if some of the F_j have discrete components. If F is continuous and $(Y_1, Y_2) \sim F$, then the unique copula is the distribution of $(U_1, U_2) = (F_1(Y_1), F_2(Y_2))$ leading to

$$C(u_1, u_2) = F\Big(F_1^{-1}(u_1), F_2^{-1}(u_2)\Big), \quad 0 \le u_j \le 1, j = 1, 2,$$

where F_j^{-1} are inverse cdfs. In particular, if $\Phi_2(\cdot; \rho)$ is the bivariate normal (BVN) cdf with correlation ρ and standard normal margins, and Φ is the univariate standard normal cdf, then the BVN copula is

$$C(u_1, u_2) = \Phi_2\Big(\Phi^{-1}(u_1), \Phi^{-1}(u_2); \rho\Big).$$

The major advantage of copulas for dependence modelling is that the dependence structure may be separated from the univariate margins; see, for example, Section 1.6 of Joe (1997). If $C(\cdot; \theta)$ is a parametric family of copulas and $F_j(\cdot; \eta_j)$ is a parametric model for the jth univariate margin, then

$$C\Big(F_1(y_1; \eta_1), F_2(y_2; \eta_2); \theta\Big)$$

is a bivariate parametric model with univariate margins F_1, F_2. For copula models, the variables can be continuous or discrete (Nikoloulopoulos, 2013; Nikoloulopoulos and Joe, 2015).

3 A joint copula-based Markov model

For ease of exposition, let T be the dimension of a "panel" and n the number of clusters. The theory can be extended to varying cluster sizes. Let p be the number of covariates, that is, the dimension of a covariate vector $\mathbf{x}$. Let $Y^\star \sim \mathcal{F}$ be a latent variable, such that $Y = y$ if $\alpha_{y-1} + \mathbf{x}^T\boldsymbol{\beta} \le Y^\star \le \alpha_y + \mathbf{x}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}$, $y = 1, \ldots, K$, where K is the number of categories of Y (without loss of generality, assume $\alpha_0 = -\infty$ and $\alpha_K = \infty$), and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is the p-dimensional regression vector. From this definition, the response Y is assumed to have density

$$f(y; \mu, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \mathcal{F}(\alpha_y + \mu) - \mathcal{F}(\alpha_{y-1} + \mu),$$

where $\mu = \mathbf{x}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a function of $\mathbf{x}$ and the p-dimensional regression vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, and $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{K-1})$ is the q-dimensional vector of the univariate cutpoints ($q = K - 1$). Note that $\mathcal{F}$ normal leads to the ordinal probit model for ordinal response, $\mathcal{F}$ logistic leads to the ordinal cumulative logit model.

Suppose that data are $(y_{itj}, \mathbf{x}_{itj})$, $i = 1, ..., n$, $t = 1, \ldots, T$, $j = 1, 2$ where i is an index for individuals or clusters, t is an index for the repeated measurements or within cluster measurements, and j is an index for the gender: 1=male, 2=female. The univariate marginal model for Y_{itj} is $f_j(y_{itj}; \mu_{itj}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_j)$ where $\mu_{itj} = \mathbf{x}_{itj}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_j$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_j$ of dimension q_j be the vector of univariate cutpoints. If for each t, $Y_{i1j}, \ldots, Y_{iTj}$ are serially independent conditional on μ_{itj}, then the log-likelihood for each gender is

$$\ell_j = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \log f_j(y_{itj}; \mu_{itj}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_j). \tag{2}$$

For estimation of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_j$ when $Y_{i1j}, \ldots, Y_{iTj}$ are dependent we consider copula-based Markov models (Joe, 1997, page 244) for ordinal time series with covariates, where a parametric copula family is used for the joint distribution of subsequent observations and then the corresponding transition probabilities are obtained. Note in passing that Chen and Fan (2006) studied copula-based Markov models of continuous response data.

The transition cdf of Y_{tj} given $Y_{t-1,j}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} F_{j|t}(y_{tj}|y_{t-1,j}) &= P(Y_{tj} \le y_{tj} | Y_{t-1,j} = y_{t-1,j}) \\ &= \Big[C_{j|t}\big(F(y_{t-1,j}), F(y_{tj})\big) - C_{j|t}\big(F(y_{t-1,j} - 1), F(y_{tj})\big) \Big] / f(y_{t-1,j}), \end{aligned}$$

and the transition pmf is

$$f_{j|t}(y_{tj}|y_{t-1,j}) = P(Y_{tj} = y_{tj} | Y_{t-1,j} = y_{t-1,j}) = \frac{f(y_{tj}, y_{t-1,j})}{f_j(y_{t-1,j})},$$

where $f(y_t, y_{t-1}) = C_{j|t}\big(F(y_t), F(y_{t-1})\big) - C_{j|t}\big(F(y_t - 1), F(y_{t-1})\big) - C_{j|t}\big(F(y_t), F(y_{t-1} - 1)\big) + C_{j|t}\big(F(y_t - 1), F(y_{t-1} - 1)\big)$. Then the log-likelihood for each gender is

$$\ell_{j|t} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\log f_j(y_{i1j}; \mu_{i1j}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_j) + \sum_{t=2}^{T} \log f_{j|t}(y_{itj}|y_{i,t-1,j}; \mu_{itj}, \mu_{i,t-1,j}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_j) \right). \tag{3}$$

The BVN copula is a special case, and this is called "autoregressive-to-anything" in Biller and Nelson (2005) as acknowledged by Joe (2014). Other copulas would be useful for the transition probability if there is more clustering of consecutive large or small values than would be expected with BVN.

So far we treat the ordinal response of the males and the ordinal response of the females separately as if they were independent. In the sequel, we novel propose to relate these responses using a copula to couple their conditional (on the past) distributions at each time point. From Sklar (1959), there is a bivariate copula $C_{12|t}$ such that $\Pr(Y_{t1} \le y_{t1}, Y_{t2} \le y_{t2}) = C_{12|t}\big(F_{1|t}(y_{t1}|y_{t-1,1}), F_{2|t}(y_{t2}|y_{t-1,2})\big)$. Then it follows that the joint pmf is

$$\begin{aligned} &f_{12|t}(y_{t1}, y_{t2}) = \\ &C_{12|t}\big(F_{1|t}(y_{t1}|y_{t-1,1}), F_{2|t}(y_{t2}|y_{t-1,2})\big) - C_{12|t}\big(F_{1|t}(y_{t1} - 1|y_{t-1,1}), F_{2|t}(y_{t2}|y_{t-1,2})\big) - \\ &C_{12|t}\big(F_{1|t}(y_{t1}|y_{t-1,1}), F_{2|t}(y_{t2} - 1|y_{t-1,2})\big) + C_{12|t}\big(F_{1|t}(y_{t1} - 1|y_{t-1,1}), F_{2|t}(y_{t2} - 1|y_{t-1,2})\big) \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

For the joint copula-based Markov model, we let $C_{1|t}, C_{2|t}$ and $C_{12|t}$ be parametric bivariate copulas, say with parameters θ_1, θ_2 and θ, respectively. For the set of all parameters, let $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \{\boldsymbol{\beta}_j, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_j, \theta_j, \theta : j = 1, 2\}$. We model the joint distribution in terms of three bivariate copulas. There is much known about properties of parametric bivariate copula families in terms of dependence and tail behavior.

Note that the copula $C_{j|t}$ models the time-series for the jth response and the copula $C_{12|t}$ links the ordinal response for males to the ordinal response for females. Our general statistical model allows for selection of $C_{j|t}$ and $C_{12|t}$ independently among a variety of parametric copula families, i.e., there are no constraints in the choices of parametric copulas $\{C_{j|t}, C_{12|t} : j = 1, 2\}$.

4 Choices of parametric families of copulas

In our candidate set, families that have different strengths of tail behaviour (see e.g., Nikoloulopoulos et al. (2012); Nikoloulopoulos and Joe (2015)) are included. In the descriptions below, a bivariate copula C is *reflection symmetric* if its density satisfies $c(u_1, u_2) = c(1-u_1, 1-u_2)$ for all $0 \le u_1, u_2 \le 1$. Otherwise, it is reflection asymmetric often with more probability in the joint upper tail or joint lower tail. *Upper tail dependence* means that $c(1-u, 1-u) = O(u^{-1})$ as $u \to 0$ and *lower tail dependence* means that $c(u, u) = O(u^{-1})$ as $u \to 0$. If $(U_1, U_2) \sim C$ for a bivariate copula C, then $(1-U_1, 1-U_2) \sim C_{180^0}$, where $C_{180^0}(u_1, u_2) = u_1 + u_2 - 1 + C(1-u_1, 1-u_2)$ is the survival (or rotated by 180 degrees) copula of C; this "reflection" of each uniform $U(0,1)$ random variable about 1/2 changes the direction of tail asymmetry.

- Reflection symmetric copulas with tail independence satisfying $C(u, u) = O(u^2)$ and $\overline{C}(1-u, 1-u) = O(u^2)$ as $u \to 0$, such as the Frank copula with cdf

$$C(u_1, u_2; \theta) = -\theta^{-1} \log \left\{ 1 + \frac{(e^{-\theta u_1} - 1)(e^{-\theta u_2} - 1)}{e^{-\theta} - 1} \right\}, \quad \theta \in (-\infty, \infty) \setminus \{0\}.$$

- Reflection asymmetric copula family with upper tail dependence, such as the Gumbel extreme value copula with cdf

$$C(u_1, u_2; \theta) = \exp\Big[-\Big\{ (-\log u_1)^\theta + (-\log u_2)^\theta \Big\}^{1/\theta} \Big], \quad \theta \ge 1.$$

  The resulting model in this case has more probability in the joint upper tail compared to the BVN copula. That is there is more dependence of large ordinal values that would be expected with BVN.

- Reflection asymmetric copula family with lower tail dependence, such as the survival Gumbel (s.Gumbel) copula with cdf

$$C(u_1, u_2; \theta) = u_1 + u_2 - 1 + \exp\Big[-\Big\{ \big(-\log(1-u_1)\big)^\theta + \big(-\log(1-u_2)\big)^\theta \Big\}^{1/\theta} \Big], \quad \theta \ge 1.$$

  The resulting model in this case has more probability in the joint lower tail compared to the BVN copula. That is there is more dependence of small ordinal values that would be expected with BVN.

- Copulas with reflection symmetric upper and lower tail dependence, such as the bivariate Student t_ν copula with cdf

$$C(u_1, u_2; \theta) = T_2\Big(T^{-1}(u_1; \nu), T^{-1}(u_2; \nu); \theta, \nu \Big), \quad -1 \le \theta \le 1,$$

  where $T(;\nu)$ is the univariate Student t cdf with (non-integer) ν degrees of freedom, and T_2 is the cdf of a bivariate Student t distribution with ν degrees of freedom and correlation parameter

θ. A small value of ν, such as $1 \leq \nu \leq 5$, leads to a model with more probabilities in the joint upper and joint lower tails compared to the BVN copula. That is there is more dependence of large and small ordinal values than would be expected with BVN.

For this paper, the above copula families are sufficient for the applications in Section 6, since tail dependence is a property to consider when choosing amongst different families of copulas and the concept of upper/lower tail dependence is one way to differentiate families. Nikoloulopoulos and Karlis (2008) have shown that it is hard to choose a copula with similar properties from real data, since copulas with similar (tail) dependence properties provide similar fit. To depict the concept of reflection symmetric (asymmetric) tail dependence (independence), we plot contour plots of the corresponding copula densities with standard normal margins and dependence parameters corresponding to Kendall's τ value of 0.5 in Figure 1.



Figure 1: Contour plots of BVN, t_2, Frank, Gumbel and s.Gumbel copulas with standard normal margins and dependence parameters corresponding to Kendall's τ value of 0.5.

Note also also that these copulas satisfy the conditions under which a copula function generates a stationary Markov chain that satisfies mixing conditions at a geometric rate (Chen et al., 2009; Beare, 2010).

5 Estimation techniques and computational details

The log-likelihood of the joint copula-based Markov model is

$$\ell_{12|t}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\log f_{12}(y_{i11}, y_{i12}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \sum_{t=2}^{T} \log f_{12|t}(y_{it1}, y_{it2}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right). \tag{5}$$

where $f_{12|t}(\cdot)$ is given in (4) and

$$\begin{aligned} &f_{12}(y_{11}, y_{12}) = \\ &C_{12|t}\big(F_1(y_{11}), F_2(y_{12})\big) - C_{12|t}\big(F_1(y_{11}-1), F_2(y_{12})\big) - \\ &C_{12|t}\big(F_1(y_{11}), F_2(y_{12}-1)\big) + C_{12|t}\big(F_1(y_{11}-1), F_2(y_{12}-1)\big). \end{aligned}$$

The maximum likelihood (ML) estimates can be derived using the steps below:

1. For each j:
   (a) At the first step the $\ell_j(\boldsymbol{\beta}_j, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_j)$ in (2) is maximized over the univariate marginal parameters $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_j$ assuming time independence.
   (b) At the second step the $\ell_{j|t}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_j, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_j, \theta_j)$ in (3) is maximized over the copula parameter θ_j with univariate parameters $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_j$ fixed as estimated at the first step.
   (c) At the third step the $\ell_{j|t}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_j, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_j, \theta_j)$ in (3) is maximized over both the univariate parameters $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_j$ and copula parameter θ_j with initial parameters the estimates for the preceding steps.
2. At the fourth step the $\ell_{12|t}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in (5) is maximized over the copula parameter θ with all the other parameters fixed as estimated at the preceding steps.
3. At the final step the $\ell_{12|t}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in (5) is maximized over $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ with initial parameters the estimates for the preceding steps.

In the steps above the Inference function of Margins method (Joe, 1997, 2005) is used to get initial estimates.

Each of the estimated parameters can be obtained by using a quasi-Newton (Nash, 1990) method applied to the log-likelihood. This numerical method requires only the objective function, i.e., the joint log-likelihood, while the gradients are computed numerically and the Hessian matrix of the second order derivatives is updated in each iteration. The SEs of the ML estimates can be also obtained via the gradients and the Hessian computed numerically during the maximization process. Assuming that the usual regularity conditions (Serfling, 1980) for asymptotic maximum likelihood theory hold for the bivariate model as well as for its margins we have that ML estimates are asymptotically normal. Therefore one can build Wald tests to statistically judge the effect of any covariate.

6 Application to the German Socio-Economic Panel

Couples were followed during 2004–2012. Interviews were administered in 2004, every 2 years until 2008, and every year thereafter, resulting in a maximum of 7 measurements per couple. We use the 2201 couples observed at all seven time points, although our methodology does not depend on a constant "cluster" size T.

The outcome variable in our analysis is the risk attitude question which is asked in each of the seven survey years. The question is reproduced as follows:

> How do you see yourself? Are you generally a person who is fully prepared to take risks or do you try to avoid taking risks? Please tick a box on the scale, where 0 means "risk averse" and 10 means "fully prepared to take risks"
>
> | | | | | | | | | | | |
> |---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
> | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
> | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |

We also use a number of explanatory variables: number of children, log of household income, age, age-squared and education level.

We fit the joint copula-based Markov model with BVN, Gumbel, s.Gumbel, and t_ν bivariate linking copulas. For Student t_ν, choices of ν were $1, 2, \ldots, 10$. For the model we allow three different copula families, one for the male time-series, one for the female time-series and one to join them. To make it easier to compare the dependence parameters, we convert the estimated parameters to Kendall's τ's in $(0, 1)$ via the relations $\tau = \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin \theta$, $\tau = 1 + 4\theta^{-1} \left[\frac{1}{\theta} \int_0^\theta \frac{t}{e^t - 1} dt - 1 \right]$, and $\tau = 1 - \theta^{-1}$ for elliptical, Frank and Gumbel copulas in Hult and Lindskog (2002), Genest (1987), and Genest and MacKay (1986), respectively. Note that Kendall's τ only accounts for the dependence dominated by the middle of the data, and it is expected to be similar amongst different families of copulas. However, the tail dependence varies, as explained in Section 4, and is a property to consider when choosing amongst different families of copulas. For the model with t_ν we summarize the choice of integer ν with the largest maximized log-likelihood.

Since the number of parameters is the same between the models, we use the log-likelihood at estimates as a measure for goodness of fit between all the models. We further compute the Vuong's (1989) test to check if there is more probability in the joint tails than the one expected via assuming a BVN copula to couple the conditional (on the past) distributions of male and female ordinal time-series. The Vuong's test is the sample version of the difference in Kullback-Leibler divergence between two models and can be used to differentiate two parametric models which could be non-nested. Assume that we have Models 1 and 2 with parametric densities $f^{(1)}_{12|t}$ and $f^{(2)}_{12|t}$ with $C_{12|t}$ being the BVN copula and any other parametric family of copulas with different tail properties, respectively; the best fit of $C_{j|t}$ is used for the joint distribution of subsequent observations for males and females. The sample version of the difference in Kullback-Leibler divergence between two models with MLEs $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(1)}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(2)}$ is

$$\bar{D} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} D_i / N,$$

where $D_i = \log \left[\frac{f^{(2)}_{12|t}\left(Y_1, Y_2; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(2)}\right)}{f^{(1)}_{12|t}\left(Y_1, Y_2; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(1)}\right)} \right]$. Model 1 is the better fitting model if $\bar{D} < 0$, and Model 2 is the better fitting model if $\bar{D} > 0$. Vuong (1989) has shown that asymptotically under the null hypothesis $H_0 : \Delta = 0$, i.e., Models 1 and 2 have the same parametric densities $f^{(1)}$ and $f^{(2)}$,

$$z_0 = \sqrt{N} \bar{D} / s \overset{H_0}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

where $s^2 = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (D_i - \bar{D})^2$. For more details we refer the interested reader to Joe (2014); Nikoloulopoulos (2015).

For these risk data, if a respondent reports the maximum (minimum) willingness to take risk in year t, then it seems natural to expect them to report the maximum (minimum) in year $t-1$ and year $t+1$ as well. That is, based on the data descriptions, we can expect *a priori* that a model with $C_{j|t}$ being the t_ν copulas might be plausible, as in this case the data have more probability in the joint tails. Furthermore, since the sample is a mixture (males and females) we can expect *a priori* that a t_ν copula to join the the male and female time-series might be plausible, as in this case the ordinal responses can be considered as mixtures of discretized means.

Table 1 contains results from the copula-based Markov models for ordinal time series with covariates for both males and females, where a parametric copula family $C_{j|t}$ is used for the joint distribution of subsequent observations estimated separately for males and females, using data from all available years. On the evidence of the maximised log-likelihoods, it is clear that the t_ν copula with a small ν is the best-fitting model for these data, and, there is a big improvement over the "autoregressive-to-anything" (BVN copula-based Markov) model. In particular, we find that the t_4 copula is the best-fitting model for the male time series, while the t_5 is the best-fitting for female time series.

On this basis, these two copulas are chosen for the joint copula-based Markov model that couples the two univariate ordinal time series. For the joint copula-based Markov model for ordinal time series with covariates for both males and females, where a t_4 and a t_5 copula family is used for the joint distribution of subsequent observations for males and females, once again, a number of different copulas are tried to form the joint distribution of couple observations, and the results from these joint models are presented in Table 2. This time, we find that the t_5 copula provides the best fit. In fact, from the Vuong's statistic there is enough improvement compared to the BVN copula to get a highly statistical significant difference (p-value< 0.001). This result suggests some skewness to both upper and lower tail for the pair of male and female risks.

In the final (double) column of Table 2, we provide estimates together with standard errors for this joint model. The coefficients associated with the explanatory variables lead us to the following conclusions: for males, income has a strong positive effect on willingness to take risk; for females, number of children has a negative effect, while education has a positive effect.

The estimate of Kendall's τ appearing in the final column of Table 2 is 0.172 and this is strongly significant. In fact, a joint copula-based Markov model leads to better inferences than a copula-based Markov model with independence of males and females since the likelihood has been improved by $728.3 = -59942.2 - (-30445.4 - 30225.1)$. This indicates that there is strong evidence of positive dependence between males and females in the middle of the distribution (i.e. at normal levels of risk attitude). The fact that the best-fitting copula for the joint model is t_5 (instead of say, BVN) indicates that there is also positive tail dependence: risk-lovers are particularly keen to match with other risk-lovers, and risk-avoiders with risk-avoiders. This is confirmed by the Vuong's statistic of 7.831 (p-value< 0.001) reported in the final row of Table 2, which establishes clear superiority of the t_5 over the BVN.

Next, we have carried out estimation separately for two different time ranges: 2004–8 and 2009–12. Table 3 shows results from the univariate models using data from 2004–8 only, from which we conclude that the t_4 copula is provides the best-fitting model for both univariate ordinal time-series. Table 4 does the same using data from 2009-12, and finds that the best-fitting models are t_4 and t_5 for males and females respectively.

Tables 5 and 6 show results from the joint models estimated with data from 2004–8 and 2009–12 respectively, and assuming the univariate models found to be best-fitting in Tables 3 and 4. Comparing

Table 1: Estimated parameters, and joint log-likelihoods $\ell_{j|t}$ for the copula-based Markov models for ordinal time series with covariates for both males and females, where a parametric copula family $C_{j|t}$ is used for the joint distribution of subsequent observations for 2004–12 time period.

$C_{j\|t}$	BVN		Frank		Gumbel		s.Gumbel		t_4	t_5
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
α_1	-0.708	-1.381	-0.803	-1.257	-1.259	-1.839	-0.105	-1.143	-0.595	-1.507
α_2	-0.244	-0.861	-0.296	-0.719	-0.754	-1.293	0.269	-0.704	-0.165	-1.010
α_3	0.352	-0.249	0.317	-0.104	-0.130	-0.663	0.781	-0.147	0.401	-0.408
α_4	0.818	0.258	0.780	0.390	0.349	-0.150	1.210	0.341	0.859	0.099
α_5	1.126	0.600	1.077	0.721	0.661	0.191	1.505	0.681	1.166	0.444
α_6	1.719	1.256	1.647	1.363	1.249	0.825	2.094	1.346	1.762	1.103
α_7	2.116	1.664	2.034	1.773	1.630	1.201	2.497	1.765	2.160	1.508
α_8	2.703	2.193	2.622	2.314	2.172	1.666	3.102	2.316	2.743	2.029
α_9	3.478	2.867	3.402	3.013	2.845	2.224	3.907	3.028	3.494	2.680
α_{10}	3.972	3.263	3.905	3.422	3.252	2.540	4.431	3.449	3.964	3.055
# children	-0.013	-0.027	-0.011	-0.020	-0.002	-0.021	-0.007	-0.027	0.001	-0.024
log(HH income)	0.174	0.005	0.166	0.009	0.137	-0.009	0.192	0.005	0.172	0.001
Age	-0.109	0.090	-0.104	0.124	-0.112	0.004	-0.074	0.106	-0.086	0.044
Age^2	0.003	-0.012	0.004	-0.014	0.004	-0.004	0.000	-0.013	0.001	-0.008
Education	0.008	0.028	0.008	0.027	0.000	0.025	0.017	0.033	0.007	0.030
τ_j	0.308	0.289	0.347	0.322	0.336	0.314	0.334	0.307	0.334	0.309
$\ell_{j\|t}$	-30734.0	-30434.6	-30605.8	-30335.6	-30552.8	-30332.9	-30694.0	-30407.5	-30445.4	-30225.1

Age and Age^2 are scaled by factor 10^{-1} and 10^{-2} respectively.

Table 2: Estimated parameters, their standard errors, joint log-likelihoods $\ell_{12|t}$, and Vuong's statistics for the joint copula-based Markov models for ordinal time series with covariates for both males and females, where a t_4 and a t_5 copula family is used for the joint distribution of subsequent observations for males and females, respectively, and, an additional parametric copula family $C_{12|t}$ is used for the joint distribution of couple observations for the 2004–12 time period.

$C_{12\|t}$	BVN		Frank		Gumbel		s.Gumbel		t_5	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
α_1	-0.611	-1.508	-0.601	-1.508	-0.595	-1.494	-0.687	-1.625	-0.612 (0.282)	-1.507 (0.276)
α_2	-0.171	-1.005	-0.168	-1.008	-0.158	-0.990	-0.245	-1.124	-0.164 (0.282)	-0.999 (0.276)
α_3	0.405	-0.399	0.404	-0.403	0.416	-0.383	0.327	-0.521	0.414 (0.282)	-0.390 (0.276)
α_4	0.868	0.107	0.867	0.103	0.879	0.125	0.786	-0.016	0.875 (0.283)	0.118 (0.276)
α_5	1.176	0.451	1.175	0.445	1.188	0.468	1.093	0.328	1.183 (0.283)	0.460 (0.276)
α_6	1.772	1.105	1.770	1.098	1.781	1.117	1.688	0.985	1.775 (0.283)	1.111 (0.276)
α_7	2.169	1.506	2.165	1.501	2.174	1.511	2.086	1.391	2.169 (0.284)	1.509 (0.276)
α_8	2.747	2.023	2.745	2.019	2.742	2.014	2.669	1.913	2.742 (0.284)	2.018 (0.277)
α_9	3.488	2.669	3.494	2.669	3.461	2.638	3.420	2.567	3.475 (0.285)	2.652 (0.278)
α_{10}	3.952	3.041	3.965	3.045	3.902	2.997	3.892	2.945	3.930 (0.287)	3.019 (0.280)
# children	0.002	-0.022	0.005	-0.021	0.001	-0.028	0.002	-0.023	0.003 (0.015)	-0.028 (0.015)
log(HH income)	0.179	0.005	0.174	0.003	0.175	0.010	0.172	0.003	0.174 (0.022)	0.012 (0.021)
Age	-0.109	0.033	-0.099	0.037	-0.088	0.024	-0.114	-0.003	-0.086 (0.074)	0.020 (0.074)
Age^2	0.003	-0.007	0.002	-0.007	0.001	-0.007	0.004	-0.003	0.002 (0.006)	-0.006 (0.007)
Education	0.006	0.029	0.007	0.029	0.007	0.030	0.005	0.027	0.005 (0.004)	0.027 (0.004)
τ_j	0.330	0.311	0.327	0.309	0.334	0.313	0.329	0.310	0.333 (0.006)	0.312 (0.006)
τ	0.171		0.176		0.160		0.173		0.172 (0.006)	
$\ell_{12\|t}$	-60145.5		-60197.1		-60173.9		-59987.1		-59942.2	
Vuong's	z_0	p-value	z_0	p-value	z_0	p-value	z_0	p-value	z_0	p-value
test	-		-3.792	< 0.001	-1.817	0.069	8.536	< 0.001	7.831	< 0.001

Standard errors are shown in parentheses for the best fit; Age and Age^2 are scaled by factor 10^{-1} and 10^{-2} respectively.

Table 3: Estimated parameters, and joint log-likelihoods $\ell_{j|t}$ for the copula-based Markov models for ordinal time series with covariates for both males and females, where a parametric copula family $C_{j|t}$ is used for the joint distribution of subsequent observations for 2004–8 time period.

$C_{j\|t}$	BVN		Frank		Gumbel		s.Gumbel		t_4	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
α_1	-0.482	-1.268	-0.399	-1.209	-0.933	-1.549	-0.073	-0.944	-0.474	-1.312
α_2	0.195	-0.465	0.338	-0.375	-0.209	-0.719	0.517	-0.228	0.177	-0.550
α_3	0.856	0.217	1.027	0.317	0.481	-0.021	1.106	0.409	0.814	0.119
α_4	1.307	0.743	1.482	0.840	0.946	0.514	1.527	0.917	1.257	0.642
α_5	1.632	1.109	1.804	1.199	1.277	0.882	1.840	1.278	1.581	1.008
α_6	2.215	1.758	2.375	1.841	1.864	1.527	2.416	1.927	2.165	1.655
α_7	2.596	2.157	2.750	2.239	2.241	1.913	2.799	2.331	2.547	2.049
α_8	3.155	2.687	3.305	2.773	2.779	2.408	3.365	2.872	3.102	2.565
α_9	3.932	3.362	4.076	3.459	3.498	3.014	4.157	3.569	3.862	3.208
α_{10}	4.448	3.843	4.579	3.954	3.960	3.426	4.683	4.070	4.362	3.647
# children	0.003	-0.039	0.004	-0.029	0.004	-0.037	0.004	-0.037	0.006	-0.039
log(HH income)	0.199	0.047	0.208	0.044	0.183	0.041	0.212	0.058	0.207	0.051
Age	-0.035	0.122	-0.015	0.168	-0.075	0.069	-0.030	0.126	-0.071	0.059
Age^2	-0.002	-0.015	-0.003	-0.019	0.002	-0.010	-0.003	-0.016	0.000	-0.009
Education	0.011	0.033	0.011	0.033	0.003	0.030	0.016	0.036	0.008	0.034
τ_j	0.289	0.241	0.315	0.271	0.298	0.249	0.312	0.267	0.308	0.266
$\ell_{j\|t}$	-13334.0	-13140.4	-13309.2	-13103.8	-13269.6	-13110.0	-13334.8	-13119.0	-13244.7	-13062.8

Age and Age^2 are scaled by factor 10^{-1} and 10^{-2} respectively.

Table 4: Estimated parameters, and joint log-likelihoods $\ell_{j|t}$ for the copula-based Markov models for ordinal time series with covariates for both males and females, where a parametric copula family $C_{j|t}$ is used for the joint distribution of subsequent observations for 2009–12 time period.

$C_{j\|t}$	BVN		Frank		Gumbel		s.Gumbel		t_4	t_5
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
α_1	-0.271	-0.618	-0.406	-0.499	-0.633	-1.082	0.250	-0.608	-0.046	-0.771
α_2	0.141	-0.175	0.043	-0.032	-0.186	-0.611	0.596	-0.228	0.350	-0.338
α_3	0.705	0.402	0.626	0.550	0.407	-0.011	1.093	0.296	0.900	0.233
α_4	1.181	0.895	1.099	1.031	0.899	0.493	1.534	0.769	1.373	0.728
α_5	1.474	1.220	1.382	1.343	1.198	0.818	1.817	1.090	1.666	1.055
α_6	2.069	1.881	1.952	1.988	1.789	1.458	2.406	1.759	2.262	1.718
α_7	2.476	2.300	2.349	2.407	2.181	1.842	2.818	2.188	2.669	2.133
α_8	3.092	2.839	2.966	2.954	2.748	2.311	3.452	2.748	3.277	2.658
α_9	3.879	3.535	3.752	3.667	3.422	2.871	4.267	3.478	4.027	3.313
α_{10}	4.365	3.846	4.253	3.985	3.814	3.115	4.787	3.808	4.478	3.604
# children	-0.008	0.006	-0.003	0.002	0.012	0.009	-0.011	0.005	0.006	0.010
log(HH income)	0.192	0.006	0.190	0.018	0.148	-0.007	0.207	-0.008	0.180	-0.004
Age	-0.087	0.248	-0.115	0.257	-0.023	0.157	-0.051	0.249	0.008	0.219
Age^2	0.004	-0.021	0.006	-0.021	-0.001	-0.013	0.000	-0.021	-0.004	-0.018
Education	0.002	0.022	0.001	0.020	-0.002	0.020	0.010	0.025	0.004	0.023
τ_j	0.339	0.336	0.376	0.369	0.357	0.350	0.371	0.363	0.365	0.355
$\ell_{j\|t}$	-17520.4	-17316.6	-17453.8	-17264.8	-17426.2	-17245.8	-17485.2	-17312.8	-17356.6	-17198.8

Age and Age^2 are scaled by factor 10^{-1} and 10^{-2} respectively.

Table 5: Estimated parameters, their standard errors, joint log-likelihoods $\ell_{12|t}$, and Vuong's statistics for the joint copula-based Markov models for ordinal time series with covariates for both males and females, where a t_4 and a t_5 copula family is used for the joint distribution of subsequent observations for males and females, respectively, and, an additional parametric copula family $C_{12|t}$ is used for the joint distribution of couple observations for the 2004–8 time period.

$C_{12\|t}$	BVN		Frank		Gumbel		s.Gumbel		t_6	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
α_1	-0.478	-1.362	-0.477	-1.309	-0.534	-1.228	-0.601	-1.450	-0.684 (0.369)	-1.381 (0.363)
α_2	0.178	-0.598	0.178	-0.545	0.124	-0.461	0.041	-0.703	-0.024 (0.367)	-0.616 (0.361)
α_3	0.819	0.072	0.818	0.125	0.765	0.210	0.672	-0.041	0.615 (0.367)	0.053 (0.362)
α_4	1.264	0.594	1.263	0.646	1.210	0.733	1.113	0.478	1.059 (0.367)	0.575 (0.362)
α_5	1.588	0.958	1.587	1.009	1.534	1.098	1.435	0.841	1.382 (0.368)	0.938 (0.362)
α_6	2.171	1.602	2.169	1.651	2.117	1.739	2.017	1.486	1.963 (0.368)	1.580 (0.362)
α_7	2.552	1.994	2.548	2.043	2.496	2.126	2.398	1.880	2.342 (0.369)	1.969 (0.363)
α_8	3.103	2.508	3.100	2.558	3.042	2.631	2.953	2.396	2.892 (0.370)	2.479 (0.364)
α_9	3.854	3.149	3.858	3.201	3.775	3.253	3.712	3.041	3.640 (0.372)	3.113 (0.366)
α_{10}	4.347	3.583	4.359	3.641	4.246	3.670	4.212	3.479	4.129 (0.374)	3.536 (0.370)
# children	0.005	-0.039	0.006	-0.039	0.001	-0.041	0.009	-0.035	0.005 (0.019)	-0.039 (0.019)
log(HH income)	0.215	0.052	0.211	0.054	0.211	0.066	0.202	0.048	0.203 (0.031)	0.061 (0.031)
Age	-0.091	0.042	-0.082	0.055	-0.094	0.042	-0.098	0.021	-0.118 (0.100)	0.014 (0.097)
Age^2	0.002	-0.008	0.001	-0.009	0.002	-0.008	0.003	-0.006	0.005 (0.009)	-0.005 (0.009)
Education	0.006	0.032	0.007	0.033	0.006	0.032	0.005	0.031	0.004 (0.006)	0.030 (0.006)
τ_j	0.311	0.272	0.307	0.271	0.315	0.276	0.310	0.275	0.314 (0.010)	0.279 (0.010)
τ	0.142		0.149		0.135		0.143		0.146 (0.009)	
$\ell_{12\|t}$	-26150.7		-26160.1		-26143.5		-26115.4		-26078.4	
Vuong's	z_0	p-value	z_0	p-value	z_0	p-value	z_0	p-value	z_0	p-value
test	-		-1.294	0.196	0.777	0.437	3.464	0.001	5.102	< 0.001

Standard errors are shown in parentheses for the best fit; Age and Age^2 are scaled by factor 10^{-1} and 10^{-2} respectively.

Table 6: Estimated parameters, their standard errors, joint log-likelihoods $\ell_{12|t}$, and Vuong's statistics for the joint copula-based Markov models for ordinal time series with covariates for both males and females, where a t_4 and a t_5 copula family is used for the joint distribution of subsequent observations for males and females, respectively, and, an additional parametric copula family $C_{12|t}$ is used for the joint distribution of couple observations for the 2009–12 time period.

$C_{12\|t}$	BVN		Frank		Gumbel		s.Gumbel		t_5	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
α_1	-0.069	-0.775	-0.060	-0.776	-0.051	-0.761	-0.219	-0.970	-0.062 (0.423)	-0.930 (0.411)
α_2	0.337	-0.336	0.341	-0.338	0.355	-0.320	0.186	-0.535	0.352 (0.423)	-0.483 (0.411)
α_3	0.900	0.240	0.900	0.240	0.916	0.259	0.744	0.040	0.919 (0.424)	0.101 (0.411)
α_4	1.379	0.737	1.379	0.736	1.396	0.757	1.220	0.536	1.400 (0.424)	0.601 (0.411)
α_5	1.676	1.064	1.675	1.062	1.693	1.083	1.515	0.864	1.696 (0.424)	0.928 (0.412)
α_6	2.275	1.722	2.271	1.719	2.288	1.734	2.113	1.528	2.292 (0.425)	1.583 (0.412)
α_7	2.680	2.133	2.674	2.132	2.687	2.135	2.521	1.945	2.693 (0.426)	1.989 (0.412)
α_8	3.281	2.653	3.276	2.654	3.274	2.638	3.129	2.472	3.287 (0.426)	2.500 (0.413)
α_9	4.022	3.300	4.024	3.305	3.987	3.263	3.882	3.130	4.016 (0.428)	3.136 (0.415)
α_{10}	4.469	3.592	4.475	3.593	4.412	3.547	4.337	3.425	4.456 (0.431)	3.425 (0.418)
# children	0.006	0.010	0.011	0.012	0.010	0.003	0.005	0.005	0.011 (0.022)	-0.002 (0.022)
log(HH income)	0.185	0.002	0.180	-0.004	0.178	0.004	0.176	0.002	0.177 (0.029)	0.004 (0.028)
Age	-0.013	0.206	-0.003	0.219	0.017	0.208	-0.037	0.137	0.020 (0.113)	0.159 (0.114)
Age^2	-0.002	-0.017	-0.003	-0.018	-0.005	-0.018	0.000	-0.011	-0.005 (0.009)	-0.014 (0.010)
Education	0.004	0.022	0.005	0.022	0.007	0.023	0.004	0.021	0.005 (0.005)	0.022 (0.006)
τ_j	0.357	0.353	0.356	0.350	0.364	0.358	0.354	0.348	0.360 (0.008)	0.352 (0.008)
τ	0.186		0.197		0.167		0.199		0.191 (0.008)	
$\ell_{12\|t}$	-34202.2		-34217.7		-34238.9		-34087.1		-34074.5	
Vuong's	z_0	p-value	z_0	p-value	z_0	p-value	z_0	p-value	z_0	p-value
test	-		-1.451	0.147	-2.748	0.006	8.275	< 0.001	6.659	< 0.001

Standard errors are shown in parentheses for the best fit; Age and Age^2 are scaled by factor 10^{-1} and 10^{-2} respectively.

Tables 5 and 6, we note two key differences. Firstly, the estimate of Kendall's τ rises from 0.146 in 2004–8 to 0.191 in 2009–12, and moreover, it may be verified from the associated standard errors that the two 95% confidence intervals do not overlap. Hence we have evidence that Kendall's τ rises with years of marriage. The second key difference is that the best-fitting joint model for the 2004–8 data is t_6, while the best-fitting joint model for 2009–12 is t_5. There is a reduction of one in the degrees of freedom of the best-fitting t_ν copula. Both of these differences between the results in Tables 5 and 6 provide evidence that dependence increases with years of marriage; both in the middle of the distribution, and in the joint tails.

At this point it is useful to recall that the sample used in this study is restricted to couples observed in every year. Hence attrition (poorly-matched couples dropping out of the sample) is not an issue. This means that the increase in dependence seen in the comparison of Tables 4 and 6 may be interpreted as clear evidence of "socialization" (Arnett, 1995): the two members of the couple become more similar in terms of risk-attitude as their marriage progresses.

7 Discussion

Assortative mating is a concept of great interest to economists, as evidenced by the extensive theoretical and empirical literatures devoted to it, dating back to Becker (1974). The econometric modelling of assortative mating is clearly a setting in which the precise nature of the dependence between two variables representing the relevant outcomes for the two members of the couple, becomes the central focus of the analysis. The copula approach provides the ideal framework for this sort of modelling, since it brings richness to the dependence structure. For example, it allows the modelling of both joint tails and moreover allows a variety of types of asymmetry in the dependence structure. Importantly, this richness is introduced without the requirement of estimation of additional parameters.

Much is known about copulas. They have been used to great benefit in many areas (e.g., insurance, finance and hydrology), but have not been used much in economics. This paper illustrates their usefulness in a mainstream economics application: assortative mating on risk attitude. In this application, we have found evidence of both centre dependence and tail dependence. That is, over the entire range of of risk attitudes, there is a tendency for individuals to match with other individuals with similar risk attitude, and this positive dependence is particularly marked in the tails.

This conclusion has been arrived at using a novel model which we have labelled the "joint copula-based Markov model". The model consists of two stages. In the first stage, males and females are considered separately, and a copula is used to model the joint distribution of neighbouring (in time) outcomes for a given individual. The best fitting copulas thus found are then combined using a third copula that couples the two conditional distributions at each time point. In all three cases, the best-fitting copula is found to be a t_ν with a small ν, which leads to a model with more probabilities in the joint upper and joint lower tails compared to the BVN copula. In this economics application, it is highlighted that a joint model with a t_ν copula is plausible for a population that is a mixture of subpopulations, while a BVN model might be adequate for smaller homogeneous subgroups. This fact leads to the conclusion of positive dependence in the tails, and we have found strong statistical evidence to confirm this, in the form of the Vuong's statistic.

Having reached this conclusion, we then extended the analysis by applying the same two-stage procedure separately for the 2004-8 and 2009-12 data. The key results here were that both middle and tail dependence were stronger in the second time range. We interpreted this in terms of the

phenomenon of "socialization": the two members of the couple become more similar in risk attitude with the accumulation of years of marriage.

Acknowledgement

We acknowledge access to the German Socio-Economic Panel for use in this research under licence number: 2596. Thanks to Phil Bacon for outstanding data management.

References

Arnett, J. J. (1995). Broad and narrow socialization: The family in the context of a cultural theory. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 57(3):617–628.

Bacon, P. M., Conte, A., and Moffatt, P. G. (2014). Assortative mating on risk attitude. *Theory and Decision*, 77(3):389–401.

Beare, B. K. (2010). Copulas and temporal dependence. *Econometrica*, 78(1):395–410.

Becker, G. S. (1974). A Theory of Marriage. In *Economics of the Family: Marriage, Children, and Human Capital*, NBER Chapters, pages 299–351. National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

Belot, M. and Fidrmuc, J. (2010). Anthropometry of love: Height and gender asymmetries in interethnic marriages. *Economics & Human Biology*, 8(3):361–372.

Biller, B. and Nelson, B. L. (2005). Fitting time-series input processes for simulation. *Operations Research*, 53(3):549–559.

Chen, X. and Fan, Y. (2006). Estimation of copula-based semiparametric time series models. *Journal of Econometrics*, 130(2):307–335.

Chen, X., Wu, W. B., and Yi, Y. (2009). Efficient estimation of copula-based semiparametric markov models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 37(6B):4214–4253.

Chiappori, P.-A., Oreffice, S., and Quintana-Domeque, C. (2012). Fatter attraction: Anthropometric and socioeconomic matching on the marriage market. *Journal of Political Economy*, 120(4):659–695.

Chiappori, P. A., Oreffice, S., and Quintana-Domeque, C. (2015). Bidimensional matching with heterogeneous preferences in the marriage market. Economics Series Working Papers, Department of Economics, University of Oxford.

Chiappori, P. A. and Reny, P. J. (2006). *Matching to Share Risk*. New York: Columbia University.

Clark, A. E. and Etilé, F. (2006). Don't give up on me baby: Spousal correlation in smoking behaviour. *Journal of Health Economics*, 25(5):958–978.

Genest, C. (1987). Frank's family of bivariate distributions. *Biometrika*, 74(3):549–555.

Genest, C. and MacKay, J. (1986). The joy of copulas: bivariate distributions with uniform marginals. *The American Statistician*, 40(4):280–283.

Hitsch, G. J., Hortacsu, A., and Ariely, D. (2010). What makes you click? mate preferences in online dating. *Quantitative Marketing and Economics*, 8(4):393–427.

Hult, H. and Lindskog, F. (2002). Multivariate extremes, aggregation and dependence in elliptical distributions. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 34:587–608.

Joe, H. (1997). *Multivariate Models and Dependence Concepts*. Chapman & Hall, London.

Joe, H. (2005). Asymptotic efficiency of the two-stage estimation method for copula-based models. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 94(2):401–419.

Joe, H. (2014). *Dependence Modeling with Copulas*. Chapman & Hall, London.

Joe, H., Li, H., and Nikoloulopoulos, A. K. (2010). Tail dependence functions and vine copulas. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 101:252–270.

Kooreman, P. (1994). Estimation of econometric models of some discrete games. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 9(3):255–268.

McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., and Cook, J. (2001). Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27:415–444.

Nash, J. (1990). *Compact Numerical Methods for Computers: Linear Algebra and Function Minimisation*. Hilger, New York. 2nd edition.

Nelsen, R. B. (2006). *An Introduction to Copulas*. Springer-Verlag, New York.

Nikoloulopoulos, A. K. (2013). Copula-based models for multivariate discrete response data. In Durante, F., Härdle, W., and Jaworski, P., editors, *Copulae in Mathematical and Quantitative Finance*, pages 231–249. Springer.

Nikoloulopoulos, A. K. (2015). A mixed effect model for bivariate meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy studies using a copula representation of the random effects distribution. *Statistics in Medicine*, 34:3842–3865.

Nikoloulopoulos, A. K. and Joe, H. (2015). Factor copula models for item response data. *Psychometrika*, 80:126–150.

Nikoloulopoulos, A. K., Joe, H., and Li, H. (2012). Vine copulas with asymmetric tail dependence and applications to financial return data. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 56:659–3673.

Nikoloulopoulos, A. K. and Karlis, D. (2008). Copula model evaluation based on parametric bootstrap. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 52:3342–3353.

Oreffice, S. and Quintana-Domeque, C. (2010). Anthropometry and socioeconomics among couples: Evidence in the united states. *Economics & Human Biology*, 8(3):373–384.

Powdthavee, N. (2009). I can't smile without you: Spousal correlation in life satisfaction. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 30(4):675–689.

Serfling, R. J. (1980). *Approximation Theorems of Mathematical Statistics*. Wiley, New York.

Sklar, M. (1959). Fonctions de répartition à n dimensions et leurs marges. *Publications de l'Institut de Statistique de l'Université de Paris*, 8:229–231.

Vuong, Q. H. (1989). Likelihood ratio tests for model selection and non-nested hypotheses. *Econometrica*, 57(2):pp. 307–333.

Wilson, S. E. (2002). The health capital of families: an investigation of the inter-spousal correlation in health status. *Social Science & Medicine*, 55(7):1157–1172.